



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/745,435	12/26/2000	Hiroyuki Sekitani	001499	1560

7590 04/05/2004

ARMSTRONG, WESTERMAN, HATTORI,
MCLELAND & NAUGHTON
1725 K. Street, N.W., Suite 1000
Washington, DC 20006

EXAMINER

MAHMOUDI, HASSAN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2175

13

DATE MAILED: 04/05/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/745,435	SEKITANI, HIROYUKI
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Tony Mahmoudi	2175

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 January 2004.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-3 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.

3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

21 Dec 2001
BOY BOBOVICH

DOV POPOVICH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date .

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: ____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Remarks

1. In response to communications filed on 09-January-2004, claim 1 is amended per applicant's request. Claims 1-3 are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kashihara et al (U.S. patent No. 6,571,147) in view of Nguyen (U.S. patent No. 6,202,070), and further in view of Hekmatpour (U.S. Patent No. 5,806,056.)

As to claim 1, Kashihara et al teaches an information management system for manufacturing machines (see Abstract) comprising:

a database (see figure 13) that manages input and output in addition to memory of individual machine information (see column 11, line 53 through column 12, line 7), which is

a body of information concerning each machine (see column 16, line 66 through column 17, line 3);

an information processing means (see column 17, lines 10-20); and

an access means that is installed in each of the information processing means which is capable of performing addition and updating of the individual machine information (see column 17, lines 41-43, and see column 19, lines 22-62), wherein each manufacturing machine is a punch press, a lathe, a laser cutting machine or a machining center used in the industrial manufacturing facility (see column 1, lines 12-23, where "a punch press, a lathe, a laser cutting machine or a machining center used in the industrial manufacturing facility for production" is read on "a variety of apparatuses (manufacturing apparatuses, (e.g., automatic lathes, milling machines, NC machine tools, printing machines, post-printing machines, various plate making equipment, various semiconductor fabricating apparatuses), robots, transport equipment, and the like) for use in various industries (printing and plate making, machine, electric, chemical and metal industries and the like".)

Kashihara et al does not teach:

information processing means for each of a plurality of company departments; and each manufacturing machine as products of a company, the individual machine information including parts books, drawings and documents that cover designing, procurement, production, and installation, as well as customer information.

Nguyen et al teaches a computer manufacturing system architecture with enhanced software distribution functions (see Abstract), in which he teaches:

information processing for each of a plurality of company departments (see column 11, lines 6-15, where "cross-departmental coordination" is taught. "Cross departmental coordination" indicates that there is more than one department [plurality of departments], and see column 13, lines 38-51); and

each manufacturing machine as products of a company (see column 24, lines 51-62, where "building of machines to the specification of individual customers" indicate that each machine is a product of the company"); the individual machine information including parts books (see column 47, lines 4-21, where "parts books" is read on "listing of all the part numbers"), drawings and documents that cover designing, procurement, production, and installation (see column 8, lines 51-67), as well as customer information (see column 24, lines 51-58, where "customer information" is read on "customer's requested configuration".)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Kashihara et al to include information processing means for each of a plurality of company departments; and each manufacturing machine as products of a company, the individual machine information including parts books, drawings and documents that cover designing, procurement, production, and installation, as well as customer information.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Kashihara et al by the teachings of Nguyen et al, because information processing means for each of a plurality of company departments; and each manufacturing machine as products of a company, the individual machine information including parts books, drawings and documents that cover designing, procurement,

production, and installation, as well as customer information, would enable the system to provide the users with all the necessary information they would need to install, update and utilize the desired components on their production machine.

Kashihara et al as modified, still does not teach customer-inputted information and maintenance information obtained during operation of the manufacturing machine by customers in an industrial manufacturing facility before designing a new manufacturing machine.

Hekmatpour teaches a hierarchical expert system and knowledge base (see Abstract), in which he teaches customer-inputted information (see column 5, lines 47-52, where “customer-inputted information” is read on “information inputted by a user of the system” and maintenance information (see column 16, lines 4-19) obtained during operation of the manufacturing machine by customers in an industrial manufacturing facility (see column 5, lines 47-57, and see column 8, lines 33-53) before designing a new manufacturing machine (see column 13, lines 16-21.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Kashihara et al as modified to include customer-inputted information and maintenance information obtained during operation of the manufacturing machine by customers in an industrial manufacturing facility before designing a new manufacturing machine.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Kashihara et al as modified, with the teaching of Hekmatpour, because including customer-inputted information and maintenance information

obtained during operation of the manufacturing machine by customers in an industrial manufacturing facility before designing a new manufacturing machine, would enable the system to obtain detailed post-installation maintenance data from manufacturing machines, in order to diagnose and expedite appropriate updates and repairs, and would enable the system to collect customer feedback (e.g. likes, dislikes, etc.), as well as maintenance information during the trial operation of the system, before the system becomes an integral part of a manufacturing process, as taught by Hekmatpour (see column 13, lines 16-21.)

As to claim 2, Kashihara et al as modified teaches wherein the database is connected to the information processing means (see Kashihara et al, column 11, line 65 through column 12, line 20) of the departments and the customers via a network (see Kashihara et al, column 2, line 60 through column 3), information processing means of the customers having an access means that is capable of performing addition and updating the individual machine information of the database (see Kashihara et al, column 17, lines 41-43, and see column 19, lines 22-62.)

As to claim 3, Kashihara et al as modified teaches wherein the company departments include a sales department, a technical department, a procurement department, a production department, and a maintenance service department (see Nguyen et al, column 11, lines 6-13, where “distribution” and “cross-departmental coordination” are taught. It is inherent that larger companies consist of various departments including Sales, Technical, Procurement, Production, and Maintenance Service departments”), with the database having an access

limiting function that limits addition and updating of information in the individual machine information depending on the departments and the customers (see Nguyen et al, column 9, lines 19-25.)

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed on 09-January-2004 with respect to claims 1-3 have been fully considered but they are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).
Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2175

6. Any inquiries concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tony Mahmoudi whose telephone number is (703) 305-4887. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays-Fridays from 08:00 am to 04:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici, can be reached at (703) 305-3830.

tm

March 22, 2004



DOV POPOVICI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100